

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the claims is requested.

Claims 1, 3-16, and 18 had been pending.

Claims 1, 3-16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (US Patent Publication no. 2003/0220897).

New dependent claims 23-25 are added. Thus, claims 1, 3-16, 18 and 23-25 are pending for reconsideration.

In the previous Office Action the claims were allowed over Lee, however, the Office Action has withdrawn the allowability of the claims over Lee and again rejects the claims over Lee.

The independent claims are 1, 16 and 18, which are rejected as being anticipated over Lee.

The Office Action asserts that “value” result in 328 and 33 in FIG. 3 of Lee corresponds to a first display form in claim 1, and select patents in year 1997, 1996, and/or 1995 corresponds to one or more generated display items in claim 1. However, Lee is silent on an item in column 33 of Fig. 3 being selectable within the column 33. Furthermore, in Lee, the year 1997, 1996 and/or 1995 is selected in the menu column 32 including check boxes 324, not in column 33. Namely, Lee does not disclose a feature “a first display form including one or more display items that are selectable within the first display form ... [and] are different from menu items.”

Furthermore, the Office Action refers to column 220 of FIG. 2. However, in Lee, when a patent in the column 220 is selected, the information of the selected patent is displayed in a column 23. Therefore, Lee does not disclose the aforementioned claim 1 feature of “a first display form including one or more display items that are selectable within the first display form ... [and] are different from menu items” where the “one or more display items that are selectable within the first display form by said user by selecting a display region of the one or more display items within the first display form for a follow up search process using a second search condition, are different from menu items ...” In other words, in Lee FIG. 2 selection of a patent in column 220 is silent on any “follow up search process using a second search condition.”

The rejection of claim 1 can be withdrawn.

Independent claims 16 and 18 emphasize features similar to the discussed features of claim 1.

The remaining dependent claims inherit the patentable recitations of their respective base claims, and therefore, patentably distinguish over the cited art for the reasons discussed above in addition to the additional features recited therein. New dependent claims 23-25 emphasize the types of first and second display forms.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

/Mehdi D. Sheikerz/

Date: October 6, 2011 By: _____
Mehdi D. Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501